

REMARKS

The Examiner's Action mailed on August 24, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully considered. Additionally attached to this Amendment is a Petition for a One-month Extension of Time, extending the period for response to December 24, 2006.

Further attached to this Amendment is payment for the excess claim fee of \$1,350, due to the 27 extra claims in excess of 20.

In this Amendment, Applicant has amended independent claim 1, re-written the subject matter of allowable claim 6 as new independent claim 58, and presented dependent claims 32-57. Claims 1, 28 and 58 are the independent claims. Claims 1-58 are pending in the application. For at least the following reasons, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has objected to claim 29 for an informality. In response, claim 29 has been amended in the manner proposed by the Examiner's Action. It is requested that this objection be withdrawn.

It is noted with great appreciation that the Examiner considers claims 28-31 as being allowed, and the subject matter of dependent claims 6 and 7 as being allowable over the art of record. As noted above, dependent claim 6 has been re-written as new independent claim 58, which includes the subject matter of base claim 1, intervening claim 5, and allowable claim 6, thus placing claim 58 in *prima facie* condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, and 8-22 as being obvious over *Norman et al.* in view of *Abe*. It is submitted that these claims are *prima facie*

patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Applicant's independent claim 1 recites an interconnecting line which extends from an upper side of a first thin semiconductor film, over a surface of the substrate, to an upper side of a second thin semiconductor film, and electrically connecting a semiconductor device in the first thin semiconductor film to a first terminal in the second thin semiconductor film. This claimed invention is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references.

As acknowledged by the Examiner's Action, *Norman et al.* do not disclose or suggest Applicant's claimed interconnecting line. To overcome this admitted deficiency, the Examiner's Action relies on the teachings of *Abe*. *Abe* discloses a substrate 31 having a laser diode 34 thereon, which laser diode converts electrical signals from an integrated circuit 33, which is disposed on a silicon thin film 32. The Examiner's Action has equated the laser diode 34 (which is also referred to in the drawings with the reference character LD) as being a semiconductor device, as recited within claim 1, and has equated the silicon thin film 32 as being a thin semiconductor film, as likewise recited within claim 1. While it may be that these devices are electrically connected, as recited by claim 1, there is no disclosure or suggestion from this reference of an interconnecting line which extends from an upper side of the first thin semiconductor film, over a surface of the substrate, to an upper side of the second thin semiconductor film, as recited by claim 1. In fact, as shown in Figure 1, there does not appear to be any feature that is connected to the upper side of the laser diode 34, much less an interconnecting line which is

connected to both the upper surface of the laser diode 34 and the film 32, as would be required by Applicant's independent claim 1. As such, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's independent claim 1 is *prima facie* patentably distinguishable over the cited references. It is thus requested that this claim, and the claims dependent therefrom, be allowed and that these rejections be withdrawn.

The Examiner has also rejected dependent claim 5 as being obvious over *Norman et al.* in view of *Abe*, and further in view of *Sakai et al.* However, because *Sakai et al.* do not overcome the above-noted deficiencies of *Norman et al.* and *Abe*, it is submitted that claim 5 is *prima facie* patentably distinguishable over the cited combination of references for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1, from which this claim depends, as well as for the additional features recited therein. It is requested that this claim be allowed, and that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 1 and 23-27 as being obvious over *Koga et al.* in view of *Norman et al.* and *Abe*. It is submitted that these claims are *prima facie* patentably distinguishable over the cited combination of references for at least the following reasons.

As acknowledged by the Examiner's Action, *Koga et al.* fail to disclose or suggest Applicant's claimed interconnecting line, and thus relies on the teachings of *Norman et al.* and *Abe* to overcome this admitted deficiency. However, and as argued above, neither *Norman et al.* nor *Abe* disclose this feature as it is currently recited within claim 1. As such, it is submitted that claim 1, and the claims

dependent therefrom, are *prima facie* patentably distinguishable over the cited combination of references. It is requested that these claims be allowed and that these rejections be withdrawn.

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Such action, and the passing of this case to issue are requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would help to expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Should the remittance be accidentally missing or insufficient the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 18-0002, and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Robert H. Berdo, Jr. – Reg. No. 38,075  
RABIN & BERDO, PC – Cust. No. 23995  
Telephone: 202-371-8976  
Fax: 202-408-0924

December 14, 2006  
Date

RHB/vm

AMENDMENT of December 14, 2006

10/705,895